

**Dexter City Council Meeting  
September 12, 2022**

**Additional Updates**

**September Planning Commission Meeting Update.** The following is a summary of the comments/concerns expressed by members of the public who were present for the Planning Commission meeting.

- There were 14 members of the public in the audience. Of those 14:
  - Two (2) from 3670 Central Street
  - Two (2) from 3416 Central
  - One from 3436 Central
  - Two (2) own the property at 3255 Central
  - One (1) owns the property at 3268 Central
  - One (1) from 7690 Fourth St
  - One (1) owns property at 8055 Huron
  - Two (2) from 7615 Ann Arbor
  - One (1) owns property at 8155 Huron
  - One did not provide an address, but staff learned after the meeting he was not a resident.

Staff and the Planning Consultant have discussed the comments received from the residents/property owners and offer the following impressions from the meeting:

- Concern about retail uses being allowed in their neighborhood(s). The current R-1B is a single-family zone. The proposed VR-1 form-based district would allow retail uses as special land uses, which made many participating in the meeting uncomfortable to angry. One gentleman said that the proposed change of zoning district would decrease his housing value. Others talked about the amount that they had invested in their homes and felt that it was threatened. More businesses would bring more traffic and detract from the walkability and quality of life in their neighborhoods.
- One woman said that she had grown up in Ann Arbor and recently moved from there because of the businesses in neighborhoods and the smaller houses and lots crowding in and changing the nature of the area. Her sentiment seemed to crystalize to me what most of those in attendance felt who were residents. They felt that what the proposed Zoning Ordinance was creating, did not protect their homes, blocks, neighborhoods.
  - Staff comment: Revising the extent of the VR-1 zoning would be helpful to show that their concerns are valued.
- Concern about the reduced lot size in the VR-1 & VR-2 for houses. For instance, one person asked if it was possible for someone to buy five lots, knock down all the houses and then put up a series of smaller homes. The resident was told that it was possible in theory, but that type of assembly and redevelopment would be difficult. However, the proposed lot size reduction made some people present nervous that the context of their neighborhood would be changed.
- Some shared a sentiment that they felt these changes were motivated to increase tax base and businesses in the City. They felt that their interests and investments had not been valued.

- The gentleman who owns 3255 Central Street wants to use be able to use the principal structure (a/k/a Honey House) a single-family house. The property is currently mixed-use, with the principal structure having an office use on the first floor and residential use(s) on the second floor. The property also has two detached accessory structures that are rented out for residential use. He was concerned the new zoning would not allow him and his wife to live in the home (principal structure). The property is currently zoned VC, Village Commercial, of which the owner is aware. Single-family residential uses are not allowed in the VC District. The proposed change to Central Business District (CBD), which is consistent with the Master Plan, would not restrict any use that isn't already restricted.
- The owner of vacant property at 3268 Central also voiced a desire to construct a single-family dwelling. Prior to purchasing the property, the owner was informed that current zoning is VC Village Commercial and single-family residential uses are not allowed in the VC District. At that same time, the owner was informed of the City's intent to expand the Central Business District and rezone the property to CBD.
- There was concern express by some that areas that had not been commercial before were being rezoned to Village Commercial. In reality, those areas proposed for Village Commercial are zoned Commercial in some fashion, which staff and the planning consultant have tried to explain.
- Many residents were concerned and cited the letter that they had received listing proposed uses, some of which are currently allowed, but had not been listed explicitly in the letter. When we explained that many of those uses (medical marihuana home occupations and day cares) had to be allowed by state law and were currently allowed, they explained that it would have been helpful to have all of the currently allowed uses listed.
- By the end, the public attending the meeting seemed to understand how the form-based approach gave the City more tools to protect the City's character, but they had questions as to whether these changes would really protect their neighborhood or block.
- Some of the Central Street residents said they were ok with the Cider Mill open 3 times a year. They were ok with the Dexter Mill and the Dentist office, which is located in an old church, at the corner of Central and Fourth St. All were concerned that if those businesses closed, other, possibly more intense commercial use would be developed and they don't want commercial to replace commercial. However, they also don't want more residential development, either.

All who attended were encouraged to make an appointment with the Community Development Manager, for more information and for help understanding the facts.

**S'mores & More.** The Arts, Culture, and Heritage Committee will be hosting the annual S'mores & More event in Monument Park on Saturday, October 1, 2022 at 5:30pm following Dexter Daze. As part of the event, the Arts, Culture, and Heritage Committee would like to invite anyone interested to perform for the audience from the "open stage" gazebo in Monument Park. Performances could include (but is not limited to): singing a song, leading a sing-along, reading a poem or short story, performing a monologue/dialogue from a play, or playing an instrument. The event is open to the public and free to attend and/or participate. Please come and enjoy a s'more while watching and listening to the event's performers.

Performers of all ages are welcome to participate. Performances should not be more than 5-minutes and be appropriate for all age groups. To perform, pre-registration is encouraged, but not required. To sign-up to perform, please visit: <https://forms.gle/t7fdXFJF7cjinmRHL8>.

**Dan Hoey School Zone.** On Thursday, September 8<sup>th</sup>, staff received a request from the Dexter Schools regarding the location and start time of the "School Zone" signage on Dan Hoey Road. The Schools have requested to change the start time of the "School Zone" from 7:45am to 7:30am, and relocate the sign down Dan Hoey towards Walkabout Creek. Staff will be working with OHM and the DPW to evaluate this request.

**Speed Bump Request.** Staff received an e-mail request from a resident in Westridge who indicated a desire to have speed bumps installed along Eastridge. Staff has received a number of similar requests throughout the City (Forest/Jeffords, Edison, 4<sup>th</sup> St., Parkridge, Eastridge, Broad St., Lexington/Carrington, to name a few), and has generally steered residents away from the concept of speed bumps due to 1) interference with winter maintenance; 2) having to drill into the road to make the installation; 3) the tendency for people to speed in-between speed bumps; and 4) noise associated with cars and delivery vehicles running over speed bumps.

The question of "can we install speed bumps" brings-up other questions, such as: with the frequency of the request, how would we determine which streets would be eligible for a speed bump treatment? And, would there be issues relating to police/fire access on City streets?

### **Questions from Council**

From Council Member Griffin:

I just saw in our packet that there were technical difficulties during the PC meeting this past Tuesday. Is any video of the meeting available or was that part of the difficulty, too? I'd be interested in watching the video if one is available.

The recording was a part of the technical difficulties. We do have a recording of the presentation, even though the meeting was not called to order. The video is not high-quality, but staff can share the video upon request.

I noted the following stop signs on the wrong side of the sidewalk. The screenshots are from old Google Street View images, but they are still accurate with respect to the stop sign placement.

1. Forest and Baker (both sides)
2. (alley between Forest and Grand) and Baker (both sides)

We will have the Department of Public Works take a look at these locations.

p. 13: Regarding the Main Street banners, can we please get an update on those banners vis-a-vis the proposed zoning ordinance amendments?

The Main Street Banner will be regulated under Section 7.09, Signs in the Public Right-of-Way. Signs in the public right-of-way would only be allowed as follows:

- A. Signs erected by or on behalf of a governmental or other public agency, with a permit issued by the City of Dexter.
- B. Projecting signs pursuant to the provision within Article VI Signs.
- C. Portable sidewalk signs pursuant to the provisions of Article VI Signs.
- D. Banner signs as permitted by the City of Dexter. (Note: We will need to update the Main Street Banner sign application).

Staff can provide additional feedback during the council meeting.

p. 13: Regarding the new grill placed in Mill Creek Park North, does staff have a sense of how often these grills are being used? A resident expressed concern that they were never used at Community Park and should probably be taken down. Others have suggested that the grills be placed in closer proximity to the picnic tables.

Staff believes (based on anecdotal evidence) that the grill in Mill Creek Park does receive a fair amount of use, having observed its use on a number of occasions.

p. 14: What is the Hill Top discussion punch list?

Generally, "punch lists" are a list of items that must be taken care-of before a project is complete. This meeting was for water, wastewater, DPW and OHM Advisors to walk through the project to verify that items relevant to water/sewer were completed. This included: verifying that sidewalks and structures are ADA compliant; that City staff can access shutoff valves and gate valves; and verifying that language manhole lids was correct. There are one or two ADA items outstanding that we are waiting for confirmation from OHM.

p. 15: What was the complaint/resolution about the open sewer structure near Carrington and Cambridge?

The structure ended-up being an irrigation manhole and the owner was notified that it is the association's responsibility to take care of.

p. 22: Page 2 of the Planning Commission report. I think some of the PC members' terms were extended prior to the publication of the report so perhaps those dates should be updated?

Noted and corrected.

p. 25: Page 5 of the PC report includes an action taken 7/2022, which is past the end date of the report.

That was a typo, which has been corrected.

p. 26: Page 6 of the PC report: I wouldn't mind seeing some trackable numbers for ordinance enforcement (e.g., number first warnings, number of second warnings, number of violation notices, etc.). Would be nice to be able to track over time.

It was not included in the report because the planning commission has no responsibility for or oversight of enforcements. Those numbers are tracked by quarter in the excel spreadsheets following the report.

Any update on the rental inspection ordinance?

This is a long-term project. Staff has had two meetings with WC Building Dept (June and August) regarding rental inspections and a property maintenance code. The County has indicated an ability to perform the inspections, which would be logical since they have the infrastructure in place to on-board such a program. Whereas, if we decide to do it "in house", we would be starting from scratch, which will be costly and time consuming. However, before that can occur, we need to review the property maintenance code and compare it against the City's General Code, to eliminate duplicate or conflicting regulations, and then to determine what parts of the property maintenance code we want enforced, as part of a rental inspection program. Staff is performing an initial evaluation, but it is detailed and time-intensive work.

p. 55: Seems like "Questions?" section of Park Use Permit should have yes/no check boxes or an instruction to check all that apply and then reword as statements (e.g., This is an annual event. / This event has occurred before. / This event is free/open to the public.) Also, is it possible/does it matter if an event is open to the public but not free or not open to the public and free? If so, then ask whether free and open to the public separately.

#### **Questions**

- ☒ Annual event?
- ☒ Event has occurred before?
- ☒ Free/open for public attendance?

Staff will look into making changes to this section of the permit application to clarify. Yes, it is possible for an event to be free and not open to the public (i.e. wedding ceremony), or for an event to be open to the public and not free (i.e. a race event – may not be free to participate, but may be free to watch).